



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,656	11/03/2000	Mark John McGrath	450110-02870	7570
20999	7590 08/11/2005		EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.			BOCCIO, VINCENT F	
	AVENUE- 101H FL. K, NY 10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2616	
		DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/705,656	MCGRATH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Vincent F. Boccio	2616			
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the set or extended peri	CATION. f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep nication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty utory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI ill, by statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>Amendment of 5/16/05</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL .	b)☐ This action is non-final.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 25-31 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 25-31 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrict.	e withdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any object					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including t					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
application from the Internation	locuments have been received. locuments have been received in Ap f the priority documents have been r al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action	itor a list of the certified copies not re	eceivea.			
Attachment(s)	∧ □	(PTO 412)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT and Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	O-948) Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) -·			

DETAILED ACTION

The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2616.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1-5 and new claims 25-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities:

There is two claim 30 s, one is on page 6 and the other is on page 7, the examiner will address the claim based on the claim number 30 and pages 6 & 7.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made. This application currently names joint inventors. considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the

examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-5, 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan et al.(US 5,956,458) in view of Dimitrova et al. and McGrath et al. (US 6,799,180).

The examiner incorporates by reference the last action against the claim wherein the examiner will address the amended claim language.

Regarding claims 1-3, Sezan fails to disclose generating metadata automatically and wherein the meta data includes a UNIQUE ID CODE for each of the parts of the material, which uniquely identifies the material being audio and video.

Dimitrova teaches a means to automatically generating meta data, using a signature the system will identify clips, wherein the signature of the query video clip is compared with signatures stored in the meta database, with video clips having signatures similar to the signatures of the query video clip identified, wherein the identified clips are done by the system automatically, allowing for retrieval and displaying by selection of a user (abstract), thereby creating retrievable selectable data or meta data, as taught by Dimitrova.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sezan by providing a means to automatically generate meta data by, as taught by Dimitrova to identify clips automatically, wherein the identification information is META data, for a user to allow for retrieval and displaying of the automatically generated data, being video clips.

McGrath teaches the utilization of UMID, materials identifier, associated with assigning number/numbers, cuts, dissolves, fades, camera shot marking, zoom, parameters, technical features, locations markers, GPS, time-zones, silence periods, tempo, beat marking, rhythm, good shot marking, as taught by McGrath.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination by incorporating the utilization of UMID for good shot or clips or parts of audio and video materials, as suggested by McGrath, to identify sections of material with UMID being unique identifiers, there by identifying desired features with the source content and further to record the meta data, as taught by Sezan to the medium.

Regarding claim 3, based on the combination the two ways of generating meta data are separate from each other, therefore, reads on that the meat data would be/can be generated at different times, therefore, communicated separately, further Sezan also has a MIC 18, for additional information or meta data, different means, separate communication of the data, also see Fig. 3 and Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 4, based on the combination as applied, further renders obvious more than one meta data generator, a portable data processor (Fig. 1, Sezan, Camcorder 12) and further obvious to store the user initiated and automatically generated meta data, as taught by Sezan (Fig. 2).

Claims 5, 25-31, have been analyzed and discussed with respect to the claims above, further to address claim 31, computer program product associated with a processor for performing the method, the examiner takes official notice that the implementation in software is obvious to those skilled in the art to implement the method with a program to facilitate e the process with associated hardware {VCR} and CPU processor control, as is obvious if not met by the combination, as would have been obvious to those skilled in the art.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Fax Information

Any response to this action should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, for communication as intended for entry, this Central Fax Number as of 7/15/05

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner of record, Monday-Tuesday & Thursday-Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Vincent F. Boccio (571) 272-7373.

Primary Examiner, Boccio, Vincent 8/8/05

VINCENT BOCCIO VINCENT BOCCIO PRIMARY EXAMINER